

The belief that lectotypes should be designated as a matter of 'routine' revisory work is surely mistaken. Many well known species do not have any existing type material, and yet their names are of undoubted application; in other instances the taxon is better delineated by the original author's type series than by a subsequent worker's arbitrary, if well meaning, restriction to a single specimen (and, for it to have any effect, other zoologists have to be aware of that restriction).

I appreciate and share the disquiet about the fact that Article 74.7.3 is, up to the present, as frequently contravened as it is followed. However, the correspondence started by Dr Pulawski may serve the very useful purpose of bringing the new provision, which I believe has much merit, to wider attention and one may hope that the requirement will be increasingly complied with. Present ignorance of the Article is not an adequate reason to delete it; if this were so many other provisions would be at risk, and stability of the Code is of great importance.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Hydrobia* Hartmann, 1821 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) and *Cyclostoma acutum* Draparnaud, 1805 (currently *Hydrobia acuta*) by the replacement of the lectotype of *H. acuta* with a neotype; proposed designation of *Turbo ventrosus* Montagu, 1803 as the type species of *Ventrosia* Radoman, 1977; and proposed emendation of spelling of HYDROBIINA Mulsant, 1844 (Insecta, Coleoptera) to HYDROBIUSINA, so removing the homonymy with HYDROBIIDAE Troschel, 1857 (Mollusca)

(Case 3087; see BZN 55: 139–145; 56: 56–63, 143–148, 187–190, 268–270; 58: 56–58)

Edmund Gittenberger

Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, P.O. Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden,
The Netherlands

Much of what has been written in the *Bulletin* on this case relates to systematics, not nomenclature. The question at issue is a simple one: should a valid lectotype designation be accepted if there is disagreement on the outcome among systematists for a variety of reasons? In other words, should Boeter's (1984) lectotype designation for *Hydrobia acuta* (Draparnaud, 1805) be allowed to stand, or should it be replaced by a neotype as proposed by Giusti et al. in their application?

In my view the Code serves as the tool to solve nomenclatural problems such as this. In this case the alternatives are not stability versus instability, but they divide systematists into two camps. Systematical considerations, forthcoming publications (demonstrating clearly that the concepts of various taxa have to be changed anyway) and the psychology of authors have no place here.

In essence the case relates to three questions:

- (a) Is the existing lectotype a former syntype?
- (b) Has the lectotype been validly designated?
- (c) Can the lectotype be identified without reasonable doubt?

There are clear affirmative answers to all three questions, agreed by both camps of systematists. I am in favour of accepting the existing lectotype. A neotype (suggesting that all the syntypes cannot be identified) would not bring the current confusion to an end. Only good taxonomic research will do this.

There is no reason to consider the type locality of *Hydrobia acuta* as an additional problem. Wilke et al. (BZN 56: 188) state somewhat inconsistently that they have studied topotypic material, while referring (p. 190) to ‘missing locality information’ and note that ‘the type locality of *H. acuta* may be the Étang du Prévost near Palavas-les-Flots . . . but it could be elsewhere in France’. Even this could be incorrect; Draparnaud described *Cylindrus obtusus* in the same (1805) work but it is certainly endemic to Austria.

This comment is fully supported by Dr H.D. Boeters and Dr G. Falkner.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) and proposed emendation of spelling of TRICHIINAE Ložek, 1956 (Mollusca) to TRICHIINAE, so removing the homonymy with TRICHIIDAE Fleming, 1821 (Insecta, Coleoptera)

(Case 2926; see BZN 57: 17–23, 109–110, 166–167, 223–227; 58: 53–56)

(1) Philippe Bouchet and Gerhard Falkner

Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, 55 rue Buffon, 75005 Paris, France

Gittenberger has proposed that the name *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 be conserved by suppressing the names *Trochulus* von Alten, 1812 (Mollusca) and *Trichia* de Haan, 1839 (Crustacea), and by ruling that it is not rendered invalid by the existence of *Trichia* von Haller, 1768 in Myxomycetes.

Rosenberg (BZN 57: 225–227) has researched cases of homonymy between genus-group names of animals and those of Myxomycetes and advocated that for consistency *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 be treated as a junior homonym of *Trichia* Hoffman, 1790 (the first author to make the name available under the zoological Code). We sympathize with this view because nomenclature becomes impenetrable when *Hemitrichia* Möllendorff, 1888 is regarded as invalid because of homonymy in the Myxomycetes, and *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840 is not. Further, we want to point out that *Trochulus* should be dated from Schröter (1788).

The name *Trochulus* was established by Chemnitz (1786) in a work placed on the Official Index by Direction 1. *Trochulus* Chemnitz, 1786 is thus not available. The application has stated (para. 5) that the name is available under Article 11.6.1 of the Code from von Alten (1812), who cited *Trochulus hispidus* in the synonymy of *Helix hispida* Linnaeus, 1758 and referred to Chemnitz. Although the work by Chemnitz has been rejected as non-binominal, we regard the name *Trochulus* as first available from Schröter (1788, p. 107), who published the binomen *Trochulus hispidus* in an index to Chemnitz’s work. The index was published independently from Chemnitz’s *Systematisches Conchylien-Cabinet*, and it satisfies the conditions of Article 11.4.3. A number of names in current use are currently dated to Schröter (1788) (for example, *Venus foliaceolamellosa*, now *Circomphalus foliaceolamellosum*). *Trochulus* Schröter, 1788 is available under Article 12.2.2 with the type species, by monotypy, *Helix hispida* Linnaeus 1758.

Additional reference

Schröter, J. S. 1788. *Vollständiges alphabetisches Namen-Register über alle zehn Bände des von dem seel. Herrn D. Martini in Berlin angefangenen, und vom Herrn Pastor Chemnitz in*